ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

In the specification, the examiner objected to the title for not being sufficiently descriptive. A new title has been provided to the Examiner. If not acceptable, the Examiner is requested to provide a suggested title.

The Examiner objected to the abstract, without providing any specific explanation as to why. Applicant's representative believes that the abstract is satisfactory, and thus requests that the objection be withdrawn. If the Examiner maintains the objection, it is requested that the Examiner explicitly identify any problems.

Claims 1-11 remain in this application. Claim 12-31 have been added without adding new matter.

Claims 1-5, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the specification does not describe and define the claimed SParser. The Examiner is directed to pages 8-17 of the specification, and FIG.s 1 and 2. The SParser, which is merely a name for a computer program or set of programs, is described in detail, including the use of examples. One skilled in the art would be able to practice the claimed SParser application without undue experimentation considering this disclosure in the specification. Further, claim1 (along with other claims) specifically list functions attributed to the SParser (see lines 24-26 and 35-42). Thus, the SParser application is well-defined and sufficiently enabled by the specification.

Claims 1- 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, the Examiner states that he is not clear as to what is meant by the SParser in claim 1 at line 27. The claim has been amended to clarify this term to read "SParser application" because the term "application" was inadvertently left off. This correction where repeated where necessary in the claim. As discussed above, the SParser application is defined in the specification. Further, claim 1 recites specific functions attributable to the SParser application. Thus, applicant's representative asserts that the SParser application is not indenfinite and is, in fact, sufficiently defined both in the specification and the claims. Thus, the rejection is moot.

The Examiner also states that it is not clear what is meant by "retrieving retrieved data" in claims 6-9. Applicant's representative maintains that this usage is not unclear. The term "retrieved data" is a descriptive term for data that is for retrieval, and thus is a defined entity. Applicant could have named the "retrieved data" to be "X", for example Thus, "retrieving retrieved data" means that the "retrieved data" named entity is "retrieved", which could have read "retrieving X". The Examiner is reminded that Applicant may be his or her own *lexicographer* as long as the meaning assigned to the term is not repugnant to the term's well known usage. *In re Hill*, 161 F.2d 367, 73 USPQ 482 (CCPA 1947). See also MPEP §2111.01. Because the usage is no repugnant to any well-known usage, the rejection is improper, and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Baber *et al.* (U.S. 6,564,259). Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baber. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Baber teaches a means of generating a unique *content page* for a user of an intranet. The content page contains pointers to other resources that may be of interest to that particular user (see col.8, line 58 to col.10, line 38). Baber does *not* teach any system or method for generating a display presentation.

Claim 1 recites "a web server" for serving a web page and for serving "at least one applet to the user computer over said communication network". Baber does not suggest this element of claim 1. The Examiner cites Baber col. 6, lines 17-31 as

teaching the serving of applets. However, a close reading of that section does not support the Examiner's interpretation. Explicitly, the reference states that [i]ntranet server software handles requests from clients for graphic, multimedia, or virtual (sic)." One skilled in the art would know that neither graphic nor multimedia is necessarily served by applets. An applet is a program that is served to the client computer. Graphics and/or multimedia can be served using data files alone for executing on user computer resident applications. There is no requirement for using applets to serve such material. Hence, the cited section does not teach the serving of applets. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over the reference for that reason.

Further, claim 1 recites a "servlet engine" for "executing servlets served by said web server according to said web page request from the user computer". Claim 6 also recites executing a servlet at lines 5-6. Claim 8 recites similar language at lines 5-8. Baber does not suggest such any such "servlet engine" and the Examiner has not suggested any such teaching is found in Baber. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Baber for this reason as well, as is claims 6 & 8.

Still further, claim 1 recites an "SParser application" for interpreting an "HTML template" wherein said SParser application is "activated by the execution of said servlet by said servlet engine". Baber does not suggest an SParser application. In addition, Baber does not suggest an SParser application actived by the execution of a servlet. Thus, for also this reason, claim 1 is patentable over the reference.

Even further, claim 1 recites a database server. The examiner suggest that the database server is taught by elements 30 & 46 of FIG. 4 in Baber. However, all that figure suggests is that HTML documents are served by a server (see col. 6, lines 34-44). There is no suggestion that a database application is used. One skilled in the art would know that a web server serving HTML documents is different than a database server. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the reference for this reason as well.

Claim 6 recites an interpreter that:

- retrieves retrieved data from a database according to said servlet execution;

- executes commands referenced in said HTML template, said commands for generating a display web page utilizing said retrieved data; and

- serves said display web page to said user computer, said display web page for generating a display presentation on said user computer

Claim 8 recites similar functions at lines 9-17. Baber does not suggest an interpreter as limited by these functions. The Examiner has cited no part of Baber as teaching these functions. Thus, for this reason also, claims 6 & 8 are patentable over the reference.

Finally, claim 1 recites further functions performed by the SParser application (see lines 35-47), none of which are taught by Baber. Thus, for all of these additional reasons, claim 1 is further patentable over the reference.

Claims 2-5, which depend on claim 1, are patentable over Baber for at least the reasons discussed for claim 1, above. Further, the Examiner has failed to provide any legally sufficient motivation to make the modifications to Baber to make claims 3 & 5 obvious with respect to Baber. Hence, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness, and thus the rejection of claims 3 & 5 is improper, and should be withdrawn.

Claims 10 & 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Griffin *et al.* (U.S. 6,442,714). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10 and 11 recite generating a display presentation including "already conducted survey data on said user computer". The Griffin disclosure is for a test system that allows a server to serve test templates to a user so that the *user* can conduct various tests on a device (See col 3, line 7 to col. 5, line 4). Further, Griffin allows the *user* to upload the test data for generating a test report. Id. There is no suggestion that a display presentation is generated using survey data, or already conducted survey data. Instead, Griffin uses test data currently generated by the *user*.

Further, claims 10 & 11 recite means for generating a "plurality of HTML

templates, each HTML template for generating a different display presentation" (see last lines of claims). Griffin does not suggest a plurality of different display presentations.

Finally, claims 10 & 11 recite utilizing retrieved stored data in place of test data and referencing its corresponding applet (see lines 32-34 & 35-37, respectively). There is no suggestion in Griffin of this limitation.

Consequently, for each of the above reasons, claims 10 & 11 are patentable over the references.

New claims 12-31 contain either one or more of the above discussed limitations that are not disclosed by the references, and/or include one or more of the limitations that the Examiner has indicated are allowable subject matter and not shown by the references. Thus, those claims are patentable over the references for those reasons.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33034US1.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: _____

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East 9th Street, Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

February 6, 2004